

**REMARKS**

***Status Of Application***

Claims 1-25 were pending in the application, of which claims 1-19 have been allowed. This Amendment adds new claims 26-28 and cancels claim 20. Thus, upon entry of this Amendment, claims 1-19 and 21-28 will be pending in this application.

In the Office Action it is noted that:

Claims 1-19 are allowed;

Claims 21-24 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims; and

Claims 20 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 5,644,432 to Doany (“Doany”).

***Claim Amendments***

Claim 20 has been cancelled.

Claims 21 and 23 have been amended to overcome the objections thereof. Claim 25 has been amended to depend from claim 21 rather than from claim 20, which is cancelled by this Amendment.

New claims 26-28 have been added to provide a more adequate basis for protection of the invention.

***Claim Objections***

The objection to claims 21-24 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, is noted.

By this Amendment, claims 21 and 23 have each been rewritten in independent form as required for allowability. Accordingly, claims 21 and 23 are each considered to be in condition for allowance.

Claim 22 depends from claim 21 and claim 24 depends from claim 23. Therefore, claims 22 and 24 are considered to be allowable for at least the reason of depending from an allowable claim. Thus, rewriting claims 22 and 24 in independent form would involve unnecessary effort and expense.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the objection to claims 21-24 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

***Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)***

By this Amendment, claim 20 has been cancelled. Thus, the rejection of claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Doany is considered moot.

The rejection of claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Doany is respectfully traversed. By this Amendment, claim 25 has been amended to depend from allowable claim 21. Therefore, claim 25 is considered to patentably distinguish Doany for at least the same reasons as allowable claim 21 from which claim 25 depends. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Doany be reconsidered and withdrawn.

***New Claims***

New claims 26-28 have been added to provide a more adequate basis for protection of the invention. No new matter has been added.

Claim 26 depends from claim 23, which is considered to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, claim 26 is considered to be allowable for at least the reason of depending from an allowable claim.

Claim 27 is an independent claim, and claim 28 depends from claim 27. Claim 27 recites *inter alia*:

a first optical path without reflections, a second optical path with one reflection, said one reflection being off of a synthesizing surface, and a third optical path with two reflections, one of said two reflections being off of an exit surface, wherein an angle between a direction normal to said exit surface and said synthesizing surface is in a range from about 40° to 50°.

Doany fails to disclose or suggest an exit surface and a synthesizing surface in a range from about 40° to 50° as recited by claim 27. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 27 patentably distinguishes over Doany.

Since claim 28 depends from claim 27 and incorporates all of the limitations of claim 27, it is respectfully submitted that claim 28 patentably distinguishes over Doany for the reasons discussed in connection with claim 27.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is considered to be in condition for allowance, and an early reconsideration and a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

This Amendment increases the number of independent claims by two from four to six and increases the total number of claims by two from twenty-five to twenty-seven, but does not present any multiple dependency claims. Accordingly, a Response Transmittal and Fee Authorization form authorizing the amount of \$204.00 to be charged to Sidley Austin Brown & Wood LLP's Deposit Account No. 18-1260 is enclosed herewith in duplicate. However, if the Response Transmittal and Fee Authorization form is missing, insufficient, or otherwise inadequate, or if a fee, other than the issue fee, is required during the pendency of this application, please charge such fee to Sidley Austin Brown & Wood LLP's Deposit Account No. 18-1260.

If an extension of time is required to enable this document to be timely filed and there is no separate Petition for Extension of Time filed herewith, this document is to be construed as also constituting a Petition for Extension of Time Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) for a period of time sufficient to enable this document to be timely filed.

Any fee required for such Petition for Extension of Time, and any other fee required by this document, other than the issue fee, and not submitted herewith, should be charged to Sidley Austin Brown & Wood LLP's Deposit Account No. 18-1260. Any refund should be credited to the same account.

Respectfully submitted,

By:



Brian E. Harris  
Registration No. 48,383  
Agent for Applicants

BEH/lb:bar:jjk  
SIDLEY AUSTIN BROWN & WOOD LLP  
717 N. Harwood, Suite 3400  
Dallas, Texas 75201  
Direct: (214) 981-3461  
Main: (214) 981-3300  
Facsimile: (214) 981-3400  
June 12, 2003

DAI 260354v2